UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/587,302	07/26/2006	Ralf Wnuk	51540	6536
/	7590 03/23/201 ABRAMS, BERDO &	EXAMINER		
1300 19TH STI		ANDERSON, DENISE R		
SUITE 600 WASHINGTON,, DC 20036		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1797	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/23/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/587,302	WNUK, RALF	
	Examiner	Art Unit	

	Denise R. Anderson	1797	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 10 March 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavited al (with appeal fee) in compliance w	Appeal. To avoid abar ., or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>4</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Aino event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(ft	iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FIL	n. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	031160
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c		cted claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.194. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.124.	* **	maliant Amandment (OTOL 224)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		npliant Amendment (r	-10L-324).
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s). Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		imely filed amendmer	t canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 11-25.		be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) rejected. <u>77-23.</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation <u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u> 	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Walter D. Griffin/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1797			

Continuation of 3. NOTE:

Applicant argues, "Claims 11-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C, section 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Relative to claim 11, the reference to 'output part' appears to be questioned. Such part refers to the driven part 54 described in the original and substitute specification. This objection is avoided by adding 'output part' to page 7 of the substitute specification." Applicant's Remarks, p. 8, lines 17-20.

The examiner responds that this creates a new issue of whether introducing a new part into the substitute Specification is (1) supported by both the original and substitute Specification and (2) overcomes the indefiniteness of the claim 11 limitation. The 112 rejection is addressed in paragraph 7 of the final rejection and is restated below.

Claim 11 recites the following limitation:

a drive being coupled to said receiving part to rotate said receiving part, including a rod-shaped drive part releasably connecting said first and second end parts and including a pneumatic motor producing alternating to and fro movements on an output part convertible into a constant drive movement in a drive direction of said drive part by a free wheel device.

The indefinite limitation starts from the word "and including a pneumatic motor."

There is no "output part" in either the original Specification or the substitute Specification. The "drive part" could be either Fig. 1, drive part 52 or Fig. 1, driven part 54. In the final rejection, the examiner interpreted the indefinite limitation to mean (1) the drive (Fig. 1, drive 34) has a pnuematic motor, as stated in the substitute Specification, p. 4, line 11 - and (2) the drive part (Fig. 1, drive 34) is coupled to the free wheel device (Fig. 1, free-wheeling device 56) with a driven part (Fig. 1, driven part 54), in keeping with the Specification's Fig. 1.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: A new issue has been raised that requires further search and/or consideration. The remaining arguments put forth were previously addressed in the final rejection.